

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

8 * * *

9 BOBBY LEE MONTGOMERY,

Case No. 2:12-cv-00817-MMD-NJK

10 Plaintiff,

ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT AND
11 v. RECOMMENDATION

12 LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE
13 DEPARTMENT, et al.,

Defendants.

14
15 Before the Court is Magistrate Judge Nancy J. Koppe's Report and
16 Recommendation ("R&R") (dkt. no. 62), recommending the Court grant Defendant Las
17 Vegas Metropolitan Police Department's Motion to Strike the Amended Complaint (dkt.
18 no. 52). Judge Koppe entered the R&R on May 7, 2014. Plaintiff filed an Objection on
19 May 23, 2014. Defendants filed a Response (dkt. no. 65) and Plaintiff filed a Reply (dkt.
20 no. 66).¹ The R&R is accepted and adopted in full.

21 On April 19, 2013, the Court entered an Order: (1) dismissing all claims against
22 individual Clark County Defendants with prejudice; (2) dismissing with leave to amend
23 claims against Clark County, LVMPD and individual defendants acting in their official
24 capacities; (3) dismissing with leave to amend claims against individual defendants
25 unsupported by allegations of their involvement in Plaintiff's injuries; and (4) dismissing

26
27

¹Plaintiff was not given permission to file his Reply (dkt. no. 66) and it is
28 procedurally improper. However, given Plaintiff's *pro se* status, the Court takes it into
consideration.

1 with leave to amend Plaintiff's malicious prosecution claims. (Dkt. no. 40 at 11–12.) The
 2 Court also determined that Plaintiff's Fourth Amendment search and seizure claims were
 3 sufficiently pled as to individual LVMPD defendants Officers Turner, Rocha, Herlean,
 4 Fenrich, Fox, Robinson and Miranda. (*Id.* at 6–7, 9.)

5 In response to the Court's order, Plaintiff filed a document titled "Opposition
 6 Pleading Motion for Judgment with Leave to Amend." (Dkt. no. 41.) The Court entered
 7 an order striking this filing, finding that, to the extent it was a proposed amended
 8 complaint, it was incoherent and failed to meet the minimum standards of Fed. R. Civ. P.
 9 8(a). (Dkt. no. 46.) In light of his *pro se* status, the Court extended the time for Plaintiff to
 10 file an amended complaint. (*Id.*) The Court stated that "[t]his case will proceed on the
 11 remaining claims in the Complaint in the event the Plaintiff fails to file a proper amended
 12 complaint in compliance with the Court's orders and Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil
 13 Procedure." (*Id.*) On February 3, 2014, Plaintiff timely filed the Amended Complaint (dkt.
 14 no. 49) and Defendant LVMPD moved to strike (dkt. no. 52). The R&R finds that the
 15 Amended Complaint fails to meet the standards of Rule 8 and recommends dismissing
 16 the Amended Complaint claims with prejudice and proceeding on the claims remaining in
 17 the Complaint, as per the Court's warning. (Dkt. no. 62.)

18 This Court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or
 19 recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party timely
 20 objects to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, then the court is required to
 21 "make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the [report and recommendation] to
 22 which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party fails to object, however,
 23 the court is not required to conduct "any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the
 24 subject of an objection." *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth
 25 Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge's
 26 report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. See *United States v.*
 27 *Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard of review
 28 employed by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to which no

1 objections were made); see also *Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D.
 2 Ariz. 2003) (reading the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Reyna-Tapia* as adopting the view that
 3 district courts are not required to review "any issue that is not the subject of an
 4 objection"). Thus, if there is no objection to a magistrate judge's recommendation, then
 5 the court may accept the recommendation without review. See, e.g., *Johnstone*, 263 F.
 6 Supp. 2d at 1226 (accepting, without review, a magistrate judge's recommendation to
 7 which no objection was filed).

8 The Court reviews the R&R *de novo*. The R&R finds that the Amended Complaint
 9 "fails to provide a short and plain statement putting [D]efendants (and the Court) on
 10 notice of his claims." (Dkt. no. 62 at 3.) The Court agrees. The Amended Complaint is
 11 over 50 pages long and largely consists of copied language from various cases and
 12 statutes interspersed with factual allegations. The result is an incoherent mix of
 13 disconnected legal authority and facts from which the Court struggles to identify
 14 Plaintiff's specific claims, the facts supporting those claims and against which
 15 Defendants the claims are asserted. Unfortunately, Plaintiff's Objection is written in the
 16 same incomprehensible style, and his Reply is brief and does not assist the Court in
 17 understanding the Amended Complaint.

18 Even under the less stringent standards afforded Plaintiff, *Hines v. Kremer*, 404
 19 U.S. 519, 520 (1970), the Amended Complaint fails to contain "a short and plain
 20 statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief" as required by Rule
 21 8(a). As Plaintiff has failed to provide a proper amended complaint that satisfies the
 22 requirements of Rule 8, despite two opportunities to do so, the Court agrees that it is
 23 appropriate to strike the Amended Complaint with prejudice and proceed on the
 24 remaining claims in Plaintiff's initial Complaint.

25 It is hereby ordered that the R&R (dkt. no. 62) is accepted and adopted in full.
 26 Defendant's Motion to Strike Amended Complaint is granted (dkt. no. 52). Plaintiff may
 27 continue to prosecute his Fourth Amendment search and seizure claims against
 28 ///

1 Defendants Turner, Rocha, Herlean, Fenrich, Fox, Robinson and Miranda in their
2 individual capacities.

3 DATED THIS 28th day of July 2014.

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



MIRANDA M. DU
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE